

REMARKS

The present Supplemental Amendment is submitted to provide several independent claims that further define the contribution of the invention over the prior art in various forms.

Each of new claims 32 and 33 is directed to essentially the same armor assembly as pending independent claim 14. Claim 32 specifies that the front panel of the armor assembly is composed of a plurality of plates. Support for the recitation of plates will be found in the Specification at page 7, penultimate paragraph, and in Figures 5 and 6.

New claim 33 specifies that the front panel has a front surface and that the armor layer is coextensive with the front surface. Support for these recitations appears in Figures 2, 3 and 4 of the Application drawing.

It is submitted that these claims distinguish patentably over the applied reference because that reference does not disclose an armor assembly composed of plates that are slanting in respect to the expected trajectory of the projectile, or an armor assembly with a front panel having a front surface, with the armor layer being coextensive with the front surface.

In addition, the present Amendment corrects a possible source of indefiniteness in claim 15.

Further, it is desired to correct one misstatement appearing in the remarks of the previous Amendment, in the paragraph extending between pages 6 and 7 of the Response. Specifically, it was stated at that point of the remarks that a distinguishing feature of the invention is that each armor layer is made of PMMA or epoxy resin. In fact, it is clear that claim 14 specifies that at least one armor layer is made of one of these materials. It is believed that the invention distinguishes over the prior art even for an armor assembly composed of a plurality of layers, in which one or more of the layers may not be made of those materials.

Further, with regard to the last sentence on page 7 of the remarks, it is desired to clarify that the statement that the surfaces of layers 32 and 34 in Figure 3 of the reference do not constitute means for deflecting the projectile from its original course is independent of the fact that those surfaces are not slanted relative to the expected trajectory of an oncoming projectile. As stated at the top of page 7 of the remarks, layers 32 and 34 are not armor layers and do not contribute to absorbing impact forces.

In the present case, it is desired to seek a personal interview with the Examiner after this Amendment and

Appln. No. 09/904,585
Supplemental Amd. dated September 24, 2004

the previous Amendment have been considered and the Examiner is asked to telephone undersigned counsel to discuss the suitability of such interview.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:dtb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\cohn\yeshurun3a\PTO\AMD 24SEP04.doc